

Message

From: Pamela J Lein [pjein@ucdavis.edu]
Sent: 2/23/2018 2:02:47 PM
To: Lehmann, Geniece [Lehmann.Geniece@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: PCB assessment - neurological effects - next steps

Got it.

Thanks,

Pam

From: Lehmann, Geniece [mailto:Lehmann.Geniece@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2018 12:16 PM
To: Carlson, Laura <Carlson.Laura@epa.gov>; Pamela J Lein <pjein@ucdavis.edu>; sagiv@berkeley.edu; Wright, Michael <Wright.Michael@epa.gov>; Taylor, MicheleM <taylor.michelem@epa.gov>; Persad, Amanda <Persad.Amanda@epa.gov>; pradeep.rajan@pradeeprajanllc.com; Joanne Trgovcich <Joanne.Trgovcich@icf.com>; Burch, Dave <dave.burch@icf.com>; Ali Goldstone <Ali.Goldstone@icf.com>; Robins, Sean <Sean.Robins@icf.com>
Cc: Blain, Robyn <Robyn.Blain@icf.com>; Ross, Pam <Pam.Ross@icf.com>
Subject: PCB assessment - neurological effects - next steps

PCB neuro team:

Although my hope is that you'll read all of this, I want to be especially sure that you **note the NEW TASK listed below** (due at the same time as the study quality evaluation task – March 22)

First, to clarify, at our meeting on Feb 8, there was a lot of focus on making sure that we get feedback on the study quality evaluation templates from Pam, Sharon, and Pradeep. And, I know that ICF is planning to provide feedback as well. But, I wanted to make sure that it's clear that we're asking for everyone invited to the meeting to review the templates and evaluate the pilot studies (as appropriate given their respective areas of expertise). We think it's really important to gather feedback from as many different perspectives as possible now, while we're in the early stages of the process. It'll be harder to make significant changes when we get to the point where we feel like we have an established set of criteria that we're using to evaluate studies. So, please complete the assignment (by March 22) if it's at all possible to do so.

Next, shown below is what the outcome sensitivity plot looks like after making the category adjustments identified at our meeting. I also presented this at the general PCB team meeting on Feb 12:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

NEW TASK!!!

An important task for us to complete before we move past the study quality evaluation phase will be to specifically define the endpoints that we're including in each category. This is important both for clarity and transparency regarding the studies we're including in our systematic review and also because it will be useful for developing keywords that will drive our supplemental literature searches specific for each category.

Attached to this email is an Excel file that contains draft lists of endpoints included in each of the prioritized neurological effect categories – for human studies only (Categorized endpoints - neuro_EPI.xlsx). I'll be distributing lists of endpoints measured in animal studies within the next few days. I wanted to distribute both files together, but it's been taking me some time to compile the lists, and I wanted to get them and the accompanying instructions out to reviewers as soon as possible. I'm sorry for any confusion that may result from splitting these up.

When you receive the endpoint lists relevant for your area of expertise:

- Please review these lists to make sure that the endpoints listed are appropriate for their respective categories.
- Please remove endpoints from a category if they don't belong there.
- Please add any endpoints that are missing from the lists for each category.

Note: Lists for each category are included as separate tabs in each Excel file. Because of the integrated nature of neurological function and testing, it is likely that some endpoints will fit into more than one category, and that's ok. Also, please note that these lists will be used both to define the categories and also to develop keywords for use in literature searches. So, there's some repetitiveness built into each list that reflects differences in wording that study authors might use to describe the same endpoint. And, to that end, if there are additional alternative terminologies that are sometimes used to describe the listed endpoints, please add those to the lists as well.

Revisions to the categorized endpoint lists are due on March 22.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR EACH OF THE PRIORITIZED NEUROLOGICAL EFFECT CATEGORIES:



Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Please contact me with any questions.

Thanks,
Geniece

Geniece M. Lehmann, Ph.D.
Toxicologist
National Center for Environmental Assessment
Office of Research & Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, B243-01
RTP, NC 27711

Phone: 919-541-2289 
Fax: 919-541-0245 

Notice (If This Communication Regards a Contract): Nothing in this message shall be construed as a change to the price, schedule, or terms and conditions of the contract. If the receiver does construe it otherwise, please notify me or the contracting officer immediately so that proper contract action can be initiated.